

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: *Lower Sonoran Field Office (LSFO)*

NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER: *DOI-BLM-AZ-P020-004-DNA*

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: *AZA-32584*

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Multi-year Commercial Special Recreation Permit

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T1N, R8E, Sections 1 and 2, G&SRM

APPLICANT (if any): *Superstition's OK Corral Stables, Inc. dba Goldfield Livery*

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures
Superstition OK Corral Stables dba Goldfield Livery plans to conduct commercial horseback rides on existing trails and roads, northeast of Apache Junction, AZ. Riders will originate from private land either from Ok Corral Stables located in Section 3, or from the Goldfield Ghost Town located in Section 1 (see map). Rides are available every day of the week with the high season between October and May. Ordinarily rides stop during the summer months. Party size averages 4 people with a maximum of fifteen. Each ride is approximately one hour with one guide per party. Ten tours are p

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: *Final Amendment and Environmental Assessment to the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and the Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan; Approved Amendment to the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and the Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan and Decision Record.*

Date Approved/Amended: **7/15/2005**

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Under **Recreation and Off-Highway Vehicles, Special Uses and Scarce Opportunities**, "Aside from camping and off-highway and special recreation vehicle use, activities that require a scarce resource or that pose a serious threat to public safety were identified by

the public scoping meetings as activities that could benefit from increased management. Such resource-dependent opportunities include areas for recreational gold panning, rock hounding, hang gliding launches, free climbing, aid climbing, mountain biking...equestrian uses..." (Page 24).

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA) for Superstition's OK Corral Stables, Inc. dba Goldfield Livery, NEPA No. AZ210-2005-0092, AZA-32584.

"Special Recreation Permits for Commercial Recreation Activities on Public Lands in Arizona" Environmental Assessment AZ931-93-001, August, 1993.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the exiting NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes, the proposed action is substantially the same as the action analyzed in previous environmental assessments. The impacts for the proposed action are essentially the same as analyzed in previous documents and resource conditions are sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Yes, the range of alternatives in the above referenced environmental documents is appropriate with respect to the current proposed action. No new alternatives or concerns have been presented by the public, other agencies, or resource specialists.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

Yes, the analysis in the above referenced environmental assessments is adequate given information currently available. The September 29, 2005 DNA document and current situation concludes that no new information or circumstances would

substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action. In addition, it has been determined by resource specialists that the proposed action will not have a direct or indirect impact on energy development, production, supply and/or distribution. There are no known planned or proposed energy developments and no such applications have been received by the LSFO.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Direct and indirect impacts as well as cumulative effects are substantially unchanged from those identified in the above referenced environmental assessments.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

External public involvement and interagency review for the above referenced EAs is adequate for the current proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Cheryl Blanchard	Archaeologist	Cultural/LSFO
Dave Eddy	Geologist	Minerals/LSFO
Andrea Felton	Range Conservationist	Range/LSFO
Jack Ragsdale	Outdoor Recreation Plan	Recreation/LSFO

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents

CONCLUSION:

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

 /s/ **Jack Ragsdale**

 /s/ **Leah Baker**

 /s/ **Emily H. Garber**

2/3/2011
Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.